## **EXHIBIT A**

for Docket 3533 Reference Page 7 Footnote 6

1	IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
3	DALLAS DIVISION.
4	<del></del> )
5	In Re: Chapter 11
6	HIGHLAND CAPITAL Case No.
7	MANAGEMENT, LP, 19-34054-SGJ 11
8	•
9	Debtor
10	
11	
12	
13	REMOTE DEPOSITION OF JAMES P. SEERY, JR.
14	January 29, 2021
15	10:11 a.m. EST
16	
17	•
18	
19	•
20	
21	
22	
23	Reported by:
24	Debra Stevens, RPR-CRR JOB NO. 189212
25	

```
Page 22
 1
                       J. SEERY
 2
         Q.
               Excuse me?
 3
         Α.
               I believe it does.
               Is there a subsidiary ledger
 4
         Q.
 5
     that would tell me what is the note.
 6
     component versus what is the hard asset
7
     component?
 8
         Α.
               Yes.
 9
               Who has that?
         Q.
10
         Α.
               I do.
11
               MR. DRAPER: Mr. Morris, can I
12
         get that document?
13
               MR. MORRIS:
                             I will take it
14
         under advisement.
15
         0.
               There is also a Dugaboy note in
16
     your notes that is to be sold. Is that
17
     Dugaboy note in the $40 million, or is it
18
     in the hard asset monetization?
19
               I believe it is in the -- it is
20
     to be sold, so it is not collected in
21
     full. If they default, then we would
     accelerate that and collect that in full
22
23
     as well.
24
               That doesn't answer my question
25
     unfortunately. What I am asking you, is
```

Page 23 1 J. SEERY 2 it in the \$40 million calculation, or in the \$200 million number? 3 4 It doesn't answer your question 5 because you didn't listen to my prior 6 answer. I said that the 40 million 7 calculation was for stuff that had been demanded. I think you represent -- do you 8 9 represent Dugaboy? I don't think we 10 demanded --11 I do. Excuse me? 0. 12 So if it wasn't demanded, it is 13 not in the hard asset calculation; it's in 14 the discounted amount. 15 Q. Let me try to understand your 16 answer. What you are telling me, just so 17 we are both clear, is that that Dugaboy 18 note is not in the \$40 million; it is in the balance of the 257? That is a yes or 19 20 no answer. 21 Α. I didn't take it as a question. 22 It sounded like a statement. I agree with 23 your statement. 24 0. Thank you. So the answer is 25 yes?

1	J. SEERY	Page 24
2	A. It wasn't a question. I agree	
3	with your statement; yes.	
4	Q. Thank you.	
5	Now, let's go to the	
6	November 2020 schedule that we had. If	
7	you see in the line "Estimated proceeds	
8	from monetization of assets," you had	
9	\$190 million under the plan analysis?	
10	A. Yes.	
11	Q. What percentage of that are	
12	notes versus hard assets?	
13	A. The demand notes only were	
14	included in the proceeds in terms of	
15	recovery in full. I don't quite	
16	understand your distinction between hard	
17	assets. There is a lot of intangibles as	
18	well as tangibles in the total.	
19	But if we are distinguishing	
20	between notes and other assets, the demand	
21	notes are included in the 190. The longer	
22	dated notes are assumed to be sold. So,	
23	they are included but they are included at	
24	a much lower amount.	1
25	Q. Okay. Now how much of the	

Page 25 1 J. SEERY 2 demand notes in the 190, Mr. Seery? 3 Α. Off the top of my head I don't 4 It is the Dondero demand notes as recall. 5 well as the HCFMA demand notes, so it should be about 15 to \$20 million. 6 7 Somewhere in that realm. The same as the other demand notes. 8 9 0. Were the other notes, the 10 \$40 million of notes that you referenced 11 in the January document, were they carried 12 at face or at discounted amount in the 13 190? 14 In the 190, the ones that were 15 demand were carried at face. The ones 16 that were long dated, which really at that 17 point I believe -- the only difference is 18 the \$24-and-change-million NexPoint 19 Advisors note was at a discounted amount. The others were at face. 20 21 Q. What was the discount that was 22 applied to that note? I don't recall off the top of my 23 24 head. It is pretty significant because of 25 the long dated nature of the notes.

Page 26 1 J. SEERY 2 were amended without consideration a few 3 years ago. So, for our purposes we didn't make the assumption, which I am sure will 4 5 happen, a fraudulent conveyance claim on those notes, that a fraudulent conveyance 6 7 action would be brought. We just assumed that we'd have to discount the notes 8 9 heavily to sell them because nobody would 10 respect the ability of the counterparties 11 to fairly pay. 12 And the same discount was Q. 13 applied in the liquidation analysis to those notes? 14 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Now --17 The difference -- there would be 18 a difference, though, because they would 19 pay for a while because they wouldn't want to accelerate them. So there would be 20 21 some collections on the notes for P and I. 22 Q. But in fact as of January you 23 have accelerated those notes? 24 A. Just one of them, I believe. 25 Q. Which note was that?

```
Page 27
 1
                       J. SEERY
 2
         Α.
               NexPoint, I said.
     defaulted on the note and we accelerated
 3
 4
     it.
 5
         Q.
               So there is no need to file a
     fraudulent conveyance suit with respect to
 6
 7
     that note. Correct, Mr. Seery?
 8
               MR. MORRIS: Objection to the
 9
         form of the question.
10
         Α.
               Disagree. Since it was likely
11
     intentional fraud, there may be other
     recoveries on it. But to collect on the
12
13
     note, no.
14
               My question was with respect to
     that note. Since you have accelerated it,
15
     you don't need to deal with the issue of
16
     when it's due?
17
18
               MR. MORRIS: Objection to the
19
         form of the question.
20
         Α.
               That wasn't your question. But
     to that question, yes, I don't need to
21
     deal with when it's due.
22
23
               Let me go over certain assets.
24
     I am not going to ask you for the
25
     valuation of them but I am going to ask
```

1	J. SEERY	Page 28
2	you whether they are included in the asset	
3	portion of your \$257 million number, all	i
4	right? Mr. Morris didn't want me to go	
5	into specific asset value, and I don't	
6	intend to do that.	
7	The first question I have for	
8	you is, the equity in Trustway Highland	
9	Holdings, is that included in the	
10	\$257 million number?	
11	A. There is no such entity.	
12	Q. Then I will do it in a different	
13	way. In connection with the sale of the	
14	hard assets, what assets are included in	
15	there specifically?	
16	A. Off the top of my head it is	
17	all of the assets, but it includes	
18	Trustway Holdings and all the value that	
19	flows up from Trustway Holdings. It	
20	includes Targa and all the value that	
21	flows up from Targa. It includes CCS	چىد ب
22	Medical and all the value that would flow	
23	to the Debtor from CCS Medical. It	
24	includes Cornerstone and all the value	
25	that would flow from Cornerstone. It	

1	J. SEERY	Page 29
2	includes any other securities and all the	
3	value that would flow from Cornerstone.	
4	It includes HCLOF and all the value that	
5	would flow up from HCLOF. It includes	
6	Korea and all the value that would flow up	
7	from Korea.	
8	There may be others off the top	
9	of my head. I don't recall them. I don't	
10	have a list in front of me.	
11	Q. Now, with respect to those	
12	assets, have you started the sale process	
13	of those assets?	
14	A. No. Well, each asset is	
15	different. So, the answer is, with	
16	respect to any securities, we do seek to	
17	sell those regularly and we do seek to	
18	monetize those assets where we can	
19	depending on whether there is a	
20	restriction or not and whether there is	
21	liquidity in the market.	
22	With respect to the PE assets or	
23	the companies I described Targa, CCS,	
24	Cornerstone, JHT we have not	
25	Trustway. We have not sought to sell	